DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 910 JC 770 020

AUTHOR Andrews, James
TITLE An Investigation into the Personality Characteristics of Black Activists and Non-Activists Students.
PUB DATE 14 Jul 76
NOTE 25p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; Black Power; Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; *Individual Characteristics; *Junior Colleges; Junior College Students; Mental Health; *Negro Students; Personality Assessment; *Personality Studies; Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS Edwards Personal Preference Schedule

ABSTRACT

Thirty Black activists and thirty Black non-activists were randomly selected from a list of 100 students identified as activists and 100 students identified as non-activists. Twenty-five from each group were male, and five were female; 32 freshmen and 28 sophomores were included in the sample. All subjects were administered the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule under standardized conditions to determine individual personality traits. Results of data analysis indicated: (1) the degree of activism or extent of involvement in the Black movement among Black junior college students was associated with personality characteristics; (2) Black student activists were psychologically healthier than non-activists; (3) the personality structure of the study groups differed along identifiable personality dimensions--activists had more positive self-esteem, were more self-enhancing behaviorally, and were more aware of their motives; (4) the activists appeared to have superior ego-strengths; and (5) the values held by activists were independently chosen. The data suggested that there was no psychopathology involved in the Black movement, merely personality differences. Because of the sample size, however, the results should not be generalized to the entire Black protest movement. Data are presented in tabular form and a bibliography is appended. (Author/JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED131910

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF BLACK ACTIVISTS AND NON-ACTIVISTS STUDENTS

by

James Andrews, M.A.
Mount San Antonio College

A practicum presented to Nova University
in partial fulfillment of the requirement
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

Nova University

July 14, 1976

JC 770 020

TABLE OF CONTENT

Title Page	i
Abstract	ii
Introduction	1
Background and Significance	1
Procedure	4
Hypothesis	4
Definition of Terms	4
Contribution of Study	5
Limitation of Study	5
Methodology	7
Results	8
Table 1 - Mean Score of Activist & Non-Activist Students	9
Table 2 - Trait Frequency	11
Table 3 - Frequency traits between Activist & Non-Activist Group	12
Table 4 - Analysis of six traits for two groups	13
Table 5 - Analysis of six traits for two groups	15
Discussion	16
Recommendations	18
Bibliography	

Abstract

This study investigated the personality characteristics between Black activist and non-activist college students. The central focus of this study was to investigate the need systems and personality styles of students who participate in protest groups versus those who are non-participants.

The students who were used in this study were randomly selected from 100 students identified as activist and non-activist by the faculty of Mt. San Antonio College.

Major findings emerged from this study were: (1) the degree of activism was highly coorelated to high self concept; (2) non-activist students demonstrated a poorer self esteem than activist students; (3) activismwas a result of personality differences.

Hopefully, the results from this study will be used to: (1) understand behavior patterns of Black students; (2) utilize different techniques in counseling activist and non-activist students; (3) to develop a Black psychology toward understanding Black personality styles.

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF BLACK ACTIVISTS AND NON-ACTIVISTS STUDENTS

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The psychological study of Black people in America has received volumes of controversial data (Moynihan, 1966; Jensen, 1969; Grier and Cobbs, 1968). An area which has received a particulary great deal of attention has been the study of Black personality characteristics. (Karon, 1958; Kardiner, 1968; Price, 1968; Poussiant, 1967) The research of Black personality has been established in the areas of Black motivation (Atkinson, 1972; Weiner, 1973; Poussaint, 1967; McClarent, 1962), Black learning patterns (Gunning, 1972; Jones, 1972; Jensen, 1968; Jones, 1972), Black delinquency (Axelrod, 1952; Chiver, 1942) and Black self esteem (Secholes, 1965; Kincaid, 1969; Nobles, 1972).

An area that has received very little attention in research has been the personality characteristics of Black activists and non-activists students. A paucity of research in this area has consisted primarily of commentary rather objective investigation. The lack of valid empirical data has caused an unfortunate increase in misunderstanding and confusion rather than a clear advance in knowledge on the personality characteristics of Black students. In view of this, it is the purpose of this study to investigate the personality characteristics of Black activists and non-activists students.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE:

In recent years, an increasing amount of psychological research has been generated to investigate the psychology of Blacks in the United States (Hilliard, 1972). Implicity, this approach conceives of a degree of homogeneity or similarity of perceptions, beliefs, motivations, attitudes, which differentiates Blacks from other ethnic or racial groups. The validity of this

approach is supported by sociopsychological studies of racial differences in personality characteristics and the problem and nature of the "Black experience" in the United States (Hilliard, 1972).

Recently, increased attention has been focused on the personality of Blacks, although much of the work in this area has been speculative, qualitative and theoretical (Clark, 1972). There have been few well controlled experimental studies of the psychology of Blacks (Hilliard, 1964). Furthermore, the significance of the existing experimental research is limited by both methodological and theoretical problems (Hilliard, 1972).

The most critical methodological problem is the adequacy of experimenatal control. That is, several comparative studies of Black and Whites have failed to equate the groups for such powerful variables as regions of country, education, and social class. For instance, Gossack (1957) compared northern Whites with southern Blacks of lower socioeconomic class. Obviously, definitive interpretations of the results were limited by the contamination of the data.

Another criticism is that tests standardized on Whites have been used to measure the psychological health of Blacks (Howard, 1970; Pettigrew, 1964). Other investigators suggest that separate test norms should be developed for Blacks and Whites (McDonald and Gynther, 1962). Hilliard (1969) suggests the frame of reference from which the test data is interpreted, not instrumentation, is the basic problem.

Perhaps the most neglected areas in the study of Black behavior is the psychology underlying the Black protest movement. What causes certain Blacks to resist racism and discrimination, while others passively subject themselves to this situation? Is this attributable to personality differences? If so, what ethiological circumstances foster the development of either psychological

posture? How do we account for the particular form that the protest or submission takes?

Psychological studies of Black activists have, for the most part, focused on the catalyst of the Black protest and the relationship of Black activism to personality variables such as self concept or aggressiveness (Mosby, 1972). Maliver (1965) tested the relevance of the concept of "identification with the aggressor" to Black, using Sarnoff's (attitude scale) model. His work indicates (a) that Blacks with positive self-attitudes are more likely to have participated in a protest demonstration than those who have less positive attitudes, (b) membership in a Black civil right organization (ex. NAACP) is positively correlated with positive racial attitude, and (c) students with positive attitudes make significantly more spontaneous anti-white remarks and significantly more pro-black remarks, although, this might be an artifact because these subjects express more racial comments generally. Johnson (1969) indicated that a "militant" interracial group has more positive self-attitudes than the general Black population. He concludes, "this study presents evidence that not all Negroes have negative self attitudes and, therefore, further research is needed to differentiate between different segments of the Negro community in terms of racial attitudes."

However, although there has been a flurry of investigations of certain aspects of the Black protest movement, this investigator has not found a single quantitive study that compares Black activist and non-activists on a series of personality dimensions. It is the goal of this study, to determine if there is a syndrome of personality characteristics associated with activism that differentiates Black activists from non-activists. More specificially, the focus of this research is to identify the salient traits of activists and non-activist students.

PROCEDURES:

Hilliard (1972) stated that activist students are usually involved in some type of activities or protest on college campuses. In contrast, non-activist students are not involved in protest groups. In view of Hilliard definition of activist and non-activist students it is not unreasonable to hypothesis that:

1. Students who are activily involved in protest groups will demonstrate a different scoring pattern on personality tests than non-activist students.
2. Students who are activist will score higher on such personality variables as aggression, affiliation and dominance than non-activist students.
3. Students who are non-activist will score higher on personality variables as achievement, autonomy and deference, than activist students.

DEFINITION OF TERMS:

Students who are activist are usually involved in a protest group. Therefore, for the purpose of this study an activist is:

1. Any student who is a member of the Black Student Union (BSU), Black Student Movement (BSM) and the Rights for Black Student (RFBS) protest groups.
2. A non-activist is any student who does not belong to any campus organization, and has no involvement with protest groups (BSU, BSM AND RFBS).
3. Personality is defined as those individual distinctions that determine ones behavior patterns, attitudes and daily activities.
4. Characteristic (or traits) is a distinctive qualities that certificate or identify ones conduct or abilities in a specific area.

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (Epps, 1959), is a personality scale that provides measures of 15 personality variables. The name of the variables are as follows (see Appendix A for definitions):

1. Achievement
2. Deference
3. Order
4. Exhibition
5. Autonomy
6. Affiliation
7. Intraception
8. Succorance
9. Dominance
10. Abasement
11. Nurturance
12. Change
13. Endurance
14. Heterosexuality
15. Aggression

This study will use Edwards (1959) definitions of the 15 personality traits in distinguishing activist from non-activist students.

CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY:

The major focus of this study shall be to investigate the personality difference between activist and non-activist students. The central interest of this study is to provide scientific validation to the issues that there are salient personality differences involved in Black protest groups. Hopefully, this study will lead to the present directions and the identification of the psychological characteristics of Black activist students.

The contributions made from this study will be presented to Administrators, Personnel Advisors and Professional groups involved in the study of human behavior. The present study, then, may be viewed as an initial step in the development of an independent Black Psychology, more specifically, a psychology of Black personality differences.

LIMITATIONS OF STUDY:

This study has several limitations and perhaps methodologicals boundaries. Perhaps, the most important is the use of personality test standardized on Whites to assess Black behavior. Several writers (Andrews, 1975, Williams, 1970, Noble, 1972) have expressed that Black behavior can't be assessed by using White standardized tests. The validity and reliability of the WPPS on Blacks

is extremely low and Hilliard's (1969) study supports this point of view.

Another limitation of this study is the sample size. Using a small sample, as this study does, the results can not be generalized to the entire Black protest movement. In fact, the results should be interpreted only to the population that will be investigated.

Male and female participation is another important variable that lends itself to criticism. The ratio of male to female was not equal, and data on female participation should be interpreted skeptically, if at all. Finally, the social status of families involved is an important varible. No social background information will be given on family members, making it difficult to determine the effect social status has on activist and non-activist participants.

In view of the limitations and boundaries of this study, results should be used only as a model to stimulate more intensive research on the personality differences of activist and non-activist students.

METHODOLOGY:

The sample for this study was selected from a list of 100 students identified as activists, and 100 students identified as non-activists by the faculty (teachers and administrators) of Mount San Antonio College (MT. SAC). 30 activists and 30 non-activists were randomly selected from the total population for this study. The entire sample consisted of first (freshman) and second (sophomores) year students attending MT. SAC during the winter quarter of 1976 academic year. There were 25 activists, 25 non-activist males, 5 activist and 5 non-activist females chosen for this study. Their age range was from 18-25. The mean age was 21. There were 32 freshmen and 28 sophomores in the population.

All subjects were given the Edward Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), to determine their individual personality traits. The EPPS was administered by this investigator, to all subjects in a group setting according to the directions of Edward's manual. Test results were scored according to standardized directions.

1. Evidence for the first hypothesis was obtained by (a) a comparison of the mean scores obtained between the two groups; (b) a comparison of high and low scores of each group; (c) a comparison of which traits each group scored high and low.

2. Evidence for the second hypothesis was obtained by (a) determining individual scores on aggression, affiliation and dominance from both groups; (b) attaining a mean score on these three traits and (c) compare results of activist and non-activist students.

3. Data for the third hypothesis was obtained by (a) determining individual scores on abasement, autonony and deference from both groups; (b) attaining a mean score for the three traits and (c) compare results of activist and non-activist students.

RESULTS:

Data for this study was attained by administering the EPPS test to all subjects under standardized conditions. All subjects were graded individually and scored on the norms created by Edwards (1959) for College level students. Scores were placed into classifications based on the total raw and percentile scores. Each of the 15 personality variables were tabulated to provide a range score. The range score represented the highest score vs. lowest score attained. Scores were classified under the following criteria: (1) High scores - any scores above 60 on a personality variable; (2) Normal score - any score between 40 - 59; (3) Low score - any score from 0 - 39.

Evidence for the first hypothesis was attained by computing total scores for both groups, determining frequency of scores, tabulating the mean difference was attained by subtracting the activist from the non-activist mean score. Table 1 provides the 15 traits with the raw, percentage, and mean scores. (See Table 1)

Edwards' Manuel (1959) indicates that the Standard deviation used on College level students is four points over the fifteen needs variables. He also suggested that a difference of four points - or more - on any of the fifteen needs is clinically significant. Using Edwards' criteria of four points as a mean of separating major and minor differences, analysis of data from this table, indicates little if any difference between raw scores and mean scores. Some differences were noted on percentage and mean differences betweeen lowest raw scores for activist (6) and non-activist group (5). Highest raw score for activist was 19 vs. 17 for non-activist and average raw score 9.6 for activist vs. 10 for non-activist. The difference of mean scores between the two groups was 1 point, 9.6 for activist vs. 10.6 non-activist.

The areas where differences were indicated was on percentage of scores. (Activist percentage was 45 and the non-activist group was 50). The mean difference suggested a 4 point variation between each personality characteristic, which is clinically significant. A difference in scoring patterns on traits such as Heterosexuality, Aggression, Dominance, Succorance, Affilia-

Mean scores for activist and non-activist students.

Table 1

	ACTIVIST			NON-ACTIVIST			
	RAW SCORE	% SCORE	MEAN SCORE	RAW SCORE	% SCORE	MEAN SCORE	MEAN DIFFERENCE
1. Achievement	7	18	8	12	38	12	4
2. Deference	13	69	14	14	61	13	1
3. Order	10	40	9	13	69	13	5
4. Exhibition	6	13	5	6	24	5	0
5. Autonomy	6	31	7	8	24	5	0
6. Affiliation	11	46	10	17	76	16	6
7. Intraception	8	30	7	5	18	5	-2
8. Succorance	7	25	6	14	74	13	7
9. Dominance	19	81	19	5	16	5	14
10. Abasement	6	26	5	16	66	13	-7
11. Nurturance	8	37	7	11	66	10	-3
12. Change	7	28	6	5	15	5	-1
13. Endurance	14	60	13	17	81	17	4
14. Heterosexuality	6	20	5	10	41	11	6
15. Aggression	16	83	14	5	16	4	-10
Mean Score	9.6	45	9.6	10	50	10.6	
N = 30				N = 30			

Computation utilized Edwards (1959) College level norms.

tion and Achievement were indicated, with the average difference being 8 points. Based upon the data collected, Hypothesis 1 is unproven, and is null and void. More discussion of this data will be presented under Hypothesis 3 and in the discussion section.

Tables 2 and 3 were used to provide data for Hypothesis 2. (See Table 2, 3 and 4). Table 2 provided a trait frequency for each of the 15 personality variables. Table 3 provides a comparable study of the frequency of traits between activist and non-activist groups. More specifically, table 3 provides data on the three most frequency traits, 3 least frequency traits, a mean score, highest and lowest scores between these two groups.

Data analysis suggests that the activist group three most frequency traits were Dominant, Aggression, Deference, with the highest score of 81 on Dominant. The mean score on the three most frequency traits was 76. The three least frequency traits were Achievement, Affiliation, Exhibition, with the lowest score being Exhibition. The mean of the three least frequency traits was 8. The mean score between the two groups (76 vs. 8) indicate different frequency selections between the two groups.

The non-activist group data suggests that the three most frequency traits were Endurance, Succorance and Order. The highest score was 81 (Endurance) with a mean score of 74. The 3 least frequency traits by the non-activist group were Change, Dominance and Aggresssion. Change received the lowest score (10), the mean was established at 12.

Table 4 data was attained by computing individual scores on three traits (Dominance, Aggression and Affiliation), then determining each trait mean score. Significant differences were noted in the areas of high (number of times over 60) and low scores (number of times below 40) between each group. For instance, the activist group scored over

Trait Frequency via Percentage Score

Table 2

	ACTIVIST		NON-ACTIVIST	
	Trait Frequency	Rank of High Scores	Trait Frequency	Rank of High Scores
1. Achievement	18	12	25	11
2. Deference	69	4	29	10
3. Order	40	6	69	3
4. Exhibition	12	14	25	13
5. Autonomy	14	13	29	9
6. Affiliation	11	15	58	6
7. Intraception	36	7	18	14
8. Succorance	25	10	74	2
9. Dominance	75	3	26	12
10. Abasement	81	1	37	7
11. Nurturance	46	5	65	4
12. Change	28	9	16	15
13. Endurance	31	8	81	1
14. Heterosexuality	24	11	61	5
15. Aggression	79	2	36	8
	N = 30		N = 30	

Trait frequency was compiled by changing raw score to the percentage according to Edward's manual.

Six most frequency traits between activist and non-activist group using perchentage score.

Table 3

GROUP	3 most frequent traits	3 least frequent traits	Highest Score	Lowest Score
ACTIVIST	Dominant 81	Achievement 14	Dominant	Exhibition
	Aggression 79	Affiliation 12		
	Deference 69	Exhibition 12		
N = 30	Mean Score 76	Mean Score 8		
NON-ACTIVIST	Endurance 81	Change 10	Endurance	Change
	Succorance 74	Dominant 12		
	Order 69	Aggression 14		
N = 30	Mean Score 74	Mean Score 10		

Grade on Edward's Norms for College level students

Analysis of six traits for two groups (Hypothesis 2)

Table 4

	Scores	Mean	Highest Scores	Lowest Score	Number of times over 60	Number of times under 40
ACTIVIST						
Aggression	83	14	81	64	46	0
Affiliation	18	8	24	14	0	7
Dominance	81	19	89	65	49	0
N = 30						
NON-ACTIVIST						
Aggression	15	4	31	16	0	29
Affiliation	58	12	73	52	37	0
Dominance	16	5	40	21	0	32
N = 30						

60 on Aggression 46 times and Dominance 49, the non-activist did not score over 60, one single time. In retrospect, the activist scored under 40 only 7 times while non-activist scored under 40, 61 times on these three personality traits (Aggression, Affiliation, Dominance).

Data from tables 2, 3 and 4 suggest a very definite scoring pattern between these two groups of students. Salient differences were noted in trait frequency, mean, high vs. low scores on Aggression, Affiliation, Dominance of each group. The activist viewed Dominant as the most frequent trait, while the non-activist choose Endurance. Data from tables 2, 3 and 4 support the hypothesis that activist would score higher on Aggression, Affiliation and Dominance than the non-activist group.

Table 5 provides information for Hypothesis 3. This data was attained by determining individual scores for Abasement, Autonomy and Deference for both groups, determining the mean, comparing high vs. low scores and computing the number of times each group scored over 60 (high) or under 40 (low).

The non-activist group performance on this chart show that they scored over 60 (high score), 134 times, and never failed to score below 40 in Achievement, Autonomy or Deference. Their average score on these three traits was 69 out of a possible 99, with the highest score (81) on Autonomy. Their lowest score was 54 (normal) with the highest being (96) well above normal.

The activist group scored above 60, 34 times and below 40, 100 times. Their average score was 41, with a highest score of 79 (Deference) and lowest of 18 (Achievement). The activist group mean score was 8, compared to the non-activist mean score of 16.

Data from table 5 suggests central differences between personality traits of activist and non-activist groups. In particular, differences were noted between the two groups mean scores (8 vs. 16), number times each scored

Analysis of six traits for two groups (Hypothesis 3)

Table 5

ACTIVIST N = 30	Scores	Mean	Highest Scores	Lowest Score	Number of times over 60	Number of times under 40
Achievement	26	5	40	18	0	47
Autonomy	31	7	47	21	0	33
Deference	69	12	79	61	34	30
NON-ACTIVIST N = 30						
Achievement	66	13	74	60	43	0
Autonomy	81	18	96	69	43	0
Deference	61	18	83	54	43	0

over 60 (34 for activist, 134 non-activist) number of times under 40 (100 activist, 0 non-activist) on the three traits (Achievement, Autonomy, Deference) formulated in Hypothesis 3. All the data compiled from Hypothesis 3 suggests significant scoring patterns between the activist and non-activist groups. Moreover, the data supports Hypothesis 3 in that non-activist students will score higher on personality variable such as Achievement, Autonomy and Deference, than activist students.

DISCUSSION:

Several conclusions are warranted on the basis of the analysis of the research data. First, the data clearly shows that degree of activism or extent of involvement in the Black movement among Black college students is associated with personality characteristics. That is, the Black students' typical and enduring mechanism for coping, adjusting, and relating to the world is a meaning basis for understanding the extent of activism.

Secondly, the results show the Black student activists to be overall psychologically more active (healthier) than the non-activist group. These results, then, clearly contradict the often presented "riff raff" theory of activism. That is, there is a current proclivity to conceive of Black student activists, generally, as a group of maladjusted, impulsive, degenerate, and "anarchistic" youngsters. The treatment of activists as criminals, then, is a logical sequel to such conceptualization. To the contrary, these results indicate that psychological health is associated with resistance to the well-documented oppression of Blacks in America. Perhaps, then, Black student activism might be reconceived as a reasonable response to the reality of oppression and injustice.

More specifically, the results indicate that the personality structure of the two groups differs along several identifiable personality dimensions.

First, the groups differ in terms of self-concept. Black activist students have more positive self esteem, more self-enhancing behaviorally, and are more aware of their motives. It is inferred, based on self-theory, that a person who conceives of himself negatively is more likely to accept social conditions consistent with his self definition. The activist group data suggests that they are composed of leaders, who have needs to argue for their point of view, attack others who have contrary views, and to tell others what they think (Edward, 1959). The non-activist was described as individuals who prefer to work hard on a task, keep at a job until it is finished and to have others to provide help, and receive affection from others (Edward, 1959).

Using Edward's criteria of needs, the activist group appear to have superior ego strengths and a greater faculity in cooing with a wide variety of conflicts and stressful situations.

Another major personality dimension differentiating Black activists from non-activist is the degree of independence. Essentially, the research results depict the activist as operating from a frame of reference. That their values are not "introductions" from others, but are independently chosen. Perhaps, the one single trait that is highly significant in differentiating the two groups is the level of self-abasement. The activist scored 26, while the non-activist scored 6. Edward, author of EPPS, defines abasement as:

> ...to feel guilty when one does something wrong. To accept blame when things do not go right, to feel persona' pain and misery suffered does more good than harm, to feel the need for punishment for wrong doing, to feel better when giving in and avoiding a fight than when having one's own way. To feel the need for confession of errors. To feel depressed by inability to handle situations, to feel timid in the presense of superior to feel inferior to other in most respects.

Thus, the high score of self abasement by non-activist suggest that they accommodate themselves to situations, by taking a self-effacing, passive stance. Interestingly, the EPPS manual shows abasement to be negatively

correlated with aggression. Conceivably, then, the psychological impairment and limited ego strength of the non-activists suggest that their psychic energy is utilized in maintaining themselves and therefore they have considerably less energy to invest in others. The non-activist low scores on aggressive trait support the hypothesis that they process low ego (or attacking) skills.

In conclusion, the present research provides scientific validation to the issue of psychology of Black activist students. Moreover, the data suggests very strongly that there is no psychopathology involved in Black movement, merely personality differences between those students who are involved in protest movements.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is hopeful that results from this study can be used by the faculty at Mount SAC, to understand the behavior patterns of Black students, in particular, Black activist students.
2. Perhaps, data from this study can be used to formulate new counseling techniques for Black aggressive students and those students demonstrating poor self concept.
3. Hopefully, this study will be used as a valid empirical investigation on the personality characteristics of Black students. Moreover, it is suggested that Black activism be viewed as a personality variable (characteristic).
4. Finially, it is hopeful, the present direction may lead to the identification of psychological characteristics most appropriate to the struggle for Black liberation. The present study, then, may be viewed as an initial step in the development of a Black Psychology - more specifically, a psychology toward understanding Black personality styles.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Andrews, J., Should Ability Test be Used to Assess Black Intellect, Pomona, 1-31-75, Unpublish paper.

2. Atkinson, C., Black Youth and Motivation, in Black Psychology, Harper, N.Y. 1972. P. 120

3. Axelrod, S., Negro and White Male Institutionalized Deliquents, America Journal of Sociology, 1952. 57, 569-74.

4. Chivers, W., The Negro Deliquent, Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1942-43, V33 p 56-57.

5. Cobbs, P., Black Rage, N.Y. Banton, 1968 P. 48.

6. Dreger, R., Comparative Psychological Studies of Negroes and Whites in United States, Psychological Bulletin, 1960 v. 57, 361-402.

7. Edward, A., Edwards' Personnel Preference Schedule, N.Y. Psychological Corporation, 1959.

8. Gunning, T., Blacks Learning Styles, Psychological Bulletin, 1969, V. 53 p. 341-46.

9. Greir and Cobbs, Black Rage, N.Y. 1968. P. 47.

10. Grossack, M. Personality Characteristic of Southern Negro Student, Journal of Social Psy. 1957 V. 46 p. 110

11. Hilliad, T., Black Personality, in Black Psychology, Harper, N.Y. 1972, p. 140

12. Hilliard, T. Black Student Personality, in Psychology Today, 1969 p. 130

13. Howard, J. Black Students in Transition, Unpublished Manuscript, Chicago, 1968.

14. Jensen, A., How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement? Harvard Education Review, Winter 1969, 39. 1-123

15. Jones, R. Black Intellect, Black Psychology, 1969 p. 8 N.Y.

16. Karon, C. Adult Personality Characteristics, Joun. of Social Psy. 1958, 3. P 700

17. Kincaid, L. Self Concepts of Blacks, Black Scholar, 1969. P. 8 N.Y.

18. Kordner, J. Personality Styles. Psychological Bulletin, 1968 V. 4 P 16

19. Maliver, B. Anti Negro Via amoung Negro College Students. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2 770-795

20. Moynihan, D. Employment, income, and ordeal of the Negro family, The Negro American. Boston, Mifflin 1966 p. 68

21. McDonald, R, MMPI Norm for Southern Negro, Journal of Social Psychology 1962, 58, 277-82

22. Mosby, D. Theory of the Personality of Blacks, Black Psychology 1972 N. p. 124

23. Noble, W. African Psychology: Foundation for Black Psychology Black Psychology 1972 p. 18

24. Prince and Poussaint, A Negro Psychiatrist explains the Negro Psyche, N.Y. Times 8-20-67 p. 58-60

25. Pettigrew, T. Negro American Personality: Journal of Social Issues, 1964. 20, 4-23

26. Seashore, D. Self esteems of Negros, Black Psychology, 1965, P. 10 N.Y.

27. William, R. Abuse and Misuse in Testing Black Children, Black Psychology, 1972 p. 77 N.Y.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JAN 21 1977

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES

The manifest needs associated with each of the 15 EPPS variables are:

1. ach Achievement: To do one's best, to be successful, to accomplish tasks requiring skill and effort, to be a recognized authority, to accomplish something of great significance, to do a difficult job well, to solve difficult problems and puzzles, to be able to do things better than others, to write a great novel or play.

2. def Deference: To get suggestions from others, to find out what others think, to follow instructions and do what is expected, to praise others, to tell others that they have done a good job, to accept the leadership of others, to read about great men, to conform to custom and avoid the unconventional, to let others make decisions.

3. ord Order: To have written work neat and organized, to make plans before starting on a difficult task, to have things organized, to keep things neat and orderly, to make advance plans when taking a trip, to organize details of work, to keep letters and files according to some system, to have meals organized and a definite time for eating, to have things arranged so that they run smoothly without change.

4. exh Exhibition: To say witty and clever things, to tell amusing jokes and stories, to talk about personal adventures and experiences, to have others notice and comment upon one's appearance, to say things just to see what effect it will have on others, to talk about personal achievements, to be the center of attention, to use words that others do not know the meaning of, to ask questions others cannot answer.

5. aut Autonomy: To be able to come and go as desired, to say what one thinks about things, to be independent of others in making decisions, to feel free to do what one wants, to do things that are unconventional, to avoid situations where one is expected to conform, to do things without regard to what others may think, to criticize those in positions of authority, to avoid responsibilities and obligations.

6. aff Affiliation: To be loyal to friends, to participate in friendly groups, to do things for friends, to form new friendships, to make as many friends as possible, to share things with friends, to do things with friends rather than alone, to form strong attachments, to write letters to friends.

7. int Intraception: To analyze one's motives and feelings, to observe others, to understand how others feel about problems, to put one's self in another's place, to judge people by why they do things rather than by what they do, to analyze the behavior of others, to analyze the motives of others, to predict how others will act.

8. sue Succorance: To have others provide help when in trouble, to seek encouragement from others, to have others be kindly, to have others be sympathetic and understanding about personal problems, to receive a great deal of affection from others, to have others do favors cheerfully, to be helped by others when depressed, to have others feel sorry when one is sick, to have a fuss made over one when hurt.

9. dom Dominance: To argue for one's point of view, to be a leader in groups to which one belongs, to be regarded by others as a leader, to be elected or appointed chairman of committees, to make group decisions, to settle arguments and disputes between others, to persuade and influence others to do what one wants, to supervise and direct the actions of others, to tell others how to do their jobs.

10. aba Abasement: To feel guilty when one does something wrong, to accept blame when things do not go right, to feel that personal pain and misery suffered does more good than harm, to feel the need for punishment for wrong doing, to feel better when giving in and avoiding a fight than when having one's own way, to feel the need for confession of errors, to feel depressed by inability to handle situations, to feel timid in the presence of superiors, to feel inferior to others in most respects.

11. nur Nurturance: To help friends when they are in trouble, to assist others less fortunate, to treat others with kindness and sympathy, to forgive others, to do small favors for others, to be generous with others, to sympathize with others who are hurt or sick, to show a great deal of affection toward others, to have others confide in one about personal problems.

12. chg Change: To do new and different things, to travel, to meet new people, to experience novelty and change in daily routine, to experiment and try new things, to eat in new and different places, to try new and different jobs, to move about the country and live in different places, to participate in new fads and fashions.

13. end Endurance: To keep at a job until it is finished, to complete any job undertaken, to work hard at a task, to keep at a puzzle or problem until it is solved, to work at a single job before taking on others, to stay up late working in order to get a job done, to put in long hours of work without distraction, to stick at a problem even though it may seem as if no progress is being made, to avoid being interrupted while at work.

14. het Heterosexuality: To go out with members of the opposite sex, to engage in social activities with the opposite sex, to be in love with someone of the opposite sex, to kiss those of the opposite sex, to be regarded as physically attractive by those of the opposite sex, to participate in discussions about sex, to read books and plays involving sex, to listen to or to tell jokes involving sex, to become sexually excited.

15. agg Aggression: To attack contrary points of view, to tell others what one thinks about them, to criticize others publicly, to make fun of others, to tell others off when disagreeing with them, to get revenge for insults, to become angry, to blame others when things go wrong, to read newspaper accounts of violence.